



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(or "sixth") should take the place of the word "fifteenth"; see my article on Terence in Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities. *Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*, as the typographical errors occurring in Professor Fairclough's recent edition of Vergil, and alluded to (with deference) by Professor Carroll in his review of that book, clearly show: see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 2. 69. Moreover, I think I have shown that Professor Fairclough has "nodded" also in the course of his review of my book—a far less lengthy and sleep-compelling task than that of the proof-readers of Ashmore's Terence.

But the space allowed me for this reply is limited. Professor Fairclough has discovered now that I am unkind to Eugraphius as well as to Wagner and Parry, and again cautions me against throwing stones. He is determined to have me lacking in due appreciation of the Roman grammarians, yet in quoting me to this end he should not have held back a part of what I say. But then that is his way, as I have already pointed out.

It is a little odd, if not also significant, that, whether Professor Fairclough is talking about my text or my commentary, he seems to find it hard to get away from the Andria. In consequence the larger part of my book is still without the benefit of his "searching" criticism. At Andria, 213-214, his criticism is based on his own note (see his edition of that play). But he is careful not to call attention to what my note offers to the student in lieu of that which is contained in his. Again at Andr. 304 I think I have established my point in reference to *cura confectus*. I think also that Mr. Fairclough's quotations from Ennius and Cicero tend to confirm what I have said rather than what he says. On Andr. 305 the derivation I give of *cdepol* is regarded as *probable* by Walde, Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (1905), a book highly rated by competent critics. In my note on Andr. 328 I give my reasons for preferring *haec* to *hae*. Terence had already become one of the *veteres* when Cicero wrote. On Andr. 439 Mr. Fairclough quotes only a part of my note and then says that it "will hardly hold", whereas in that very note I refer the student to his edition of the Andria, in which the "well-known rule" as to the use of *huiusce* is given in full. Any student, therefore, who is of opinion that such rules have no exceptions may easily fall back on Mr. Fairclough's teachings and discard mine. In Andr. 483 the "interesting reading *istam*" hangs on a slender thread—so much so that to discuss it, except in a special edition of the Andria, seems hardly worth while. Wessner is not convinced that Donatus "knew it", nor does the word occur in the Bembine Scholia, but only something like it. Moreover, Mr. Fairclough, in bringing it into his text (instead of *ista*) against the testimony of the 7

Mss., does violence to that very allegiance which he would force others to respect.

The space allowed me is not sufficient for a full discussion of Mr. Fairclough's remarks, nor, indeed, for more than a very meager response to his criticisms. I am not of the opinion that my book is faultless, but I do think that Professor Fairclough has failed to show either that the text is "faulty" in any real or technical sense of the word, or that the book contains "numerous errors in details", or that there is any necessity to use my edition "with caution". *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*, says Tacitus, very truly, and his words have a peculiar significance, as applied to the dubious phraseology employed by Professor Fairclough in the present "review"; for that gentleman has gone out of his way to misquote me, to give a false color to my statements, and generally to mislead the uninitiated. His remarks reflect a determined effort toward a microscopic search for pin-head faults and a manifest avoidance of all search for anything good in the book. Were it not for the animus thus displayed, his "review" would be welcomed by the editor, as every review should be that is intended to bring into relief such errors as are genuine, and of veritable importance to the student.

Schenectady, New York

S. G. ASHMORE

THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The twenty-sixth luncheon of the New York Latin Club took place at the Hotel Marlborough on Saturday, February 27. After the luncheon the guest of the Club, Professor John C. Kirtland, of Phillips Exeter Academy, set forth some of the observations he had made in a recent trip of examination to the English schools. The paper will be published in a subsequent issue of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, but it is important to remark here that Professor Kirtland showed clearly the great elasticity of the English system of Latin instruction as compared with our inelastic Caesar, Cicero and Vergil curriculum. This is an important difference and may go far to explain the machine-like kind of instruction that deadens so much of our Latin teaching.

The President reported that the committee on the subject of Greek, appointed last spring, had had a conference with Dr. Stevens, Associate Superintendent of Schools for New York City, and had been assured of the cordial good-will of the educational administration to Greek and their willingness to support it to the limit of their resources, but did not get much satisfaction in definite promises.

The Treasurer reported that the scholarship fund was completed, having reached nearly \$5,200, that this was invested in such a way that an income of \$250 a year was assured. The Club, therefore, voted that the executive committee be directed to frame

conditions for the award of the scholarship and announce such an award for this coming June if, in its judgment, the conditions warranted.

The next regular meeting will take place on May 22; the speaker will be Professor Samuel Ball Platner, of Western Reserve University.

PAPYRUS FRAGMENTS OF EURIPIDES

As fragments of papyri from Egypt become more numerous the task of collocation is increasingly involved. Of Euripides over twenty fragments have been found and published by various authorities, but, so far as is known, no complete list of them is accessible. In Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*, 6, Part I (1907), pp. 1250-1251, in the article Euripides, there is a list of eighteen such papyri, arranged for the most part chronologically. The following is an alphabetic arrangement of these with certain additional fragments which, it is believed, make the list complete up to date:

- *1. Alcestris (Andromache, Bacchae, Helena), closing chorus. 3d century B. C. Hibeh Papyri, 1. 113.
2. Andromache, 5-48. 3d century A. D. Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 3. 101, No. 449.
3. Antiope. 3d century B. C. Hermathena, 3. 38.
4. Archelaus. 2d or 3d century A. D. Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 3. 65, No. 419.
5. Electra, Hypothesis. 3d century A. D. Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 3. 66, No. 420.
6. Hippolytus, 242-459. Before the 6th century A. D. Mon. Ber. Akad. (Berlin, 1881), 982 ff.
- *7. Hypsipyle. Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 6 (1908).
8. Ino (?). Ptolemaic period. Cunningh. Mem. 9 (1893), No. 49 d.
- *9. Iphigenia among the Taurians, 174-191, 245-285, 581-595, 600-629. 3d century B. C. Hibeh Papyri, 1. 108.
10. Medea, 5-12. 2d century B. C. Un Papyrus Inédit, H. Weil, 16.
11. Medea, 710-715. 3d century A. D. Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 3. 103, No. 450.
12. Melanippe (Desmotis?). 3d century A. D. Greek Papyri, Series II. New Classical Fragments, 24.
13. Melanippe Desmotis. 4th or 5th century A. D. Zeitschr. für Äg. Sprache und Alt., 1880, 37 ff.
- *14. Oeneus (?). 3d century B. C. Hibeh Papyri, 1. 21.
15. Orestes, 338-352. Augustan age. Mitt. P. Rainer, 5 (1892), 65.
16. Orestes, 1062-1090. 2d. or 3d century A. D. Revue de Philologie, 19. 105.
17. Phoenissae, 1017-1043, 1064-1071. 3d century A. D. (?). Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 2. 114, No. 224.
18. Phoenissae, 1097-1107, 1126-1137. 4th or 5th century A. D. Mitt. P. Rainer, 5 (1892), 74 ff.
- (19. Rhesus, 48-96. 4th or 5th century A. D. S. Ber. Akad., 1887, pt. 2, 813 ff.).
20. Sciron. 6th or 7th century A. D. Amherst Papyri (Greek), 2. 8, No. 17.
21. Fragmentum de dialectica, containing quotations from eight tragedies. 2d century B. C. Not. et Extr. des Manuscrits, Bibl. Nat., Paris, 18, pt. 2.
22. Fragment (probably not Euripidean). 2d century B. C. Un Papyrus Inédit, H. Weil, 2. Cf. Wilamowitz, Herakles, 1. 41.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

L. C. SPAULDING

AN ANCIENT VIEW OF DESTRUCTIVE NATURAL PHENOMENA

The editorial in *The Nation* of February 4, "Earthquakes Then and Now", suggests the appropriateness of a reference to the discussions prevalent among Greek and Roman writers as to the question whether lightning was Jove's bolt of wrath or merely a natural force. Epicureans, Academicians, and perhaps also Cynics, with arguments probably derived from Pericles's friend Anaxagoras, were united in their attacks upon the Stoics, who defended the popular religious belief. Out of this controversy emerged a view with a decidedly modern ring. In Seneca's *Naturales Questiones*, ii, 46, we read: At quare Iuppiter aut ferienda transit aut innoxia ferit? To which the answer is given:

Sic omnia esse disposita, ut etiam quae ab illo non fiunt, tamen sine ratione non fiant, quae illius est. Nam etiamsi Iuppiter illa non facit nunc, Iuppiter fecit ut fierent. Singulis non adest, et tamen vim et causam et manum omnibus dedit.

HERMAN L. EBELING

HAMILTON COLLEGE, Clinton, N. Y.

(Reprinted from *The Nation*.)

G. E. Stechert & Co. have brought out the second edition of the English translation of Hülsen's *Das Forum Romanum* (for a review of the first edition of the translation see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, 1. 20). The present translation takes due account of the literature of the Forum for the three years that have elapsed since the appearance of the first edition. The number of illustrations has been increased from 139 to 151, and in other cases cuts have been revised and corrected. It is a pleasure to find this important work kept so thoroughly abreast of the investigations in the Forum.

*These fragments are not given in Pauly-Wissowa.